



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/507,536

03/08/2005

Theodor Graser

10191/3810

1368

26646 7590 02/25/2009

KENYON & KENYON LLP
ONE BROADWAY
NEW YORK, NY 10004

EXAMINER

DINH, BACH T

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1795

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

02/25/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Art Unit: 1795

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

The communication filed on 02/10/2009 has been considered but does not place the application in condition for allowance.

The 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph rejections of claims 16, 21, 23 and 25 are withdrawn in view of Applicant's argument.

With respect to applicant's argument regarding the 35 U.S.C. 102(b) rejection of claim 26, the argument is not persuasive for the following reason. Present claim recites "a recess is formed as a slotlike-shaped recess that widens toward an outer surface of the sensor element", the word "toward" is interpreted to include "in a direction of". Kato discloses cavity 6 is wider than the passage 14; therefore, the section of the recess disclosed by Kato comprising cavity 6 and passage 14 is widen toward or in the direction of the outer surface, which reads on the limitation of current claim.

With respect to applicant's argument regarding the 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejection of claims 13-16 and 19-25 based on the teachings of Maurer, Muller and Liang, the argument is not persuasive for the following reason. Contrary to Applicant's assertion in page 7 of the communication filed on 02/10/2009, Examiner did not state or suggest substituting the electrical connector of Liang in place of the first layer; Examiner's position is the modification of the slot like opening of the cover plate in the sensor disclosed by Maurer and Muller to have a Y-shaped opening like that of

Art Unit: 1795

Liang because such modification would guide the contacts to the conductive strip of the sensing electrode and the Y-shaped opening would not have performed a materially different function when combined in the slot like recess of the gas sensor disclosed by Maurer and Muller (see Office Action pages 6-7). Therefore, Examiner maintains the 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejection of claims 13-16 and 19-25 according to the teachings of Maurer, Muller and Liang for Applicant's argument does not fully address the content of the Office Action.

With respect to applicant's argument regarding the 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejection of claim 26 based on the teachings of Maurer, Muller, Liang and Kato, the argument is not persuasive for the same reason as addressed in the rejection of claims 13-16 and 19-25. Kato is relied on for the rejection of claim 26 in this instant is for the punching operations because the Y-shaped opening of Liang reads on the slotlike-shaped recess that widens toward the outer face of instant claim.

/Kaj K Olsen/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1795

BD
02/18/2009